# \*\*\* NOTE: TO RETURN TO THIS PAGE, CLICK ON THE COUNTY SEAL \*\*\*

CLICK HERE FOR CEO'S EXTENSION DATED AUGUST 14, 2011
CLICK HERE FOR CEO'S EXTENSION DATED AUGUST 16, 2011
CLICK HERE FOR CEO'S EXTENSION DATED SEPTEMBER 14, 2011
CLICK HERE FOR CEO'S EXTENSION DATED FEBRUARY 9, 2012
CLICK HERE FOR CEO'S FINAL RESPONSE DATED JULY 3, 2012



Kenneth Hahn Hall of Administration 500 West Temple Street, Room 713, Los Angeles, California 90012 (213) 974-1101 http://ceo.lacounty.gov

April 14, 2011

**Board of Supervisors** GLORIA MOLINA First District

MARK RIDLEY-THOMAS Second District

ZEV YAROSLAVSKY Third District

DON KNABE Fourth District

MICHAEL D. ANTONOVICH Fifth District

From:

To:

William T Fujioka

Chief Executive Officer

Supervisor Don Knabe

Mayor Michael D. Antonovich

Supervisor Mark Ridley-Thomas Supervisor Zev Yaroslavsky

Supervisor Gloria Molina

# REQUEST FOR EXTENSION TO REPORT BACK ON THE DEVELOPMENT OF A **FACILITY LOCATION POLICY**

On September 7, 2010, your Board directed this office to study the Facility Location Policies of the State of California, Federal government, and City of Los Angeles and based upon the analyses, develop revisions to the County's Facility Location Policy for consideration by your Board.

In response to your direction, we are working with deputies from each of your offices to broaden and refine the criteria to be considered under the revised Policy. We anticipate that discussions with your deputies and our analysis will be completed by the end of May 2011. We plan to return to your Board with final Policy recommendations by June 30, 2011.

Should you have any questions in the interim, your staff may contact Jan Takata at (213) 974-1360.

WTF:RLR DJT:zu

c: Executive Office, Board of Supervisors **County Counsel** 

U:\CHRONO 2011\CHRONO 2011 IWORDI\capital projects\FACILITY LOCATION POLICY.docx



Kenneth Hahn Hall of Administration 500 West Temple Street, Room 713, Los Angeles, California 90012 (213) 974-1101 http://ceo.lacounty.gov

> Board of Supervisors GLORIA MOLINA First District

MARK RIDLEY-THOMAS Second District

ZEV YAROSLAVSKY Third District

DON KNABE Fourth District

MICHAEL D. ANTONOVICH Fifth District

August 16, 2011

To:

Mayor Michael D. Antonovich

Supervisor Gloria Molina

Supervisor Mark Ridley-Thomas Supervisor Zev Yaroslavsky

Supervisor Don Knabe

From:

William T Fujioka

Chief Executive Officer

wh ()

REQUEST FOR EXTENSION OF REPORT BACK ON THE DEVELOPMENT OF A FACILITY LOCATION POLICY (SEPTEMBER 7, 2010 AGENDA, ITEM NO. 33-F)

On September 7, 2010, your Board directed this Office to study the Facility Location Policies of the State of California, Federal government, and the City of Los Angeles and, based upon the analyses, develop revisions to the County's Facility Location Policy for consideration by your Board.

In response to your direction, we continue to work with deputies from each of your offices to broaden and refine the criteria to be considered under the revised Policy. We are prepared to review a draft report back document at the Planning Deputies monthly meeting on September 8, 2011. We plan to return to your Board with final Policy recommendations by October 14, 2011.

Should you have any questions in the interim, your staff may contact Jan Takata at (213) 974-1360.

WTF:RLR:os

c: Executive Office, Board of Supervisors County Counsel

U:\CHRONO 2011\CHRONO 2011 [WORD]\Facility Location Policy\_Ext Req 10-15-11\_Ea Supv.docx

"To Enrich Lives Through Effective And Caring Service"

Please Conserve Paper - This Document and Copies are <u>Two-Sided</u> Intra-County Correspondence Sent Electronically Only



Kenneth Hahn Hall of Administration 500 West Temple Street, Room 713, Los Angeles, California 90012 (213) 974-1101 http://ceo.lacounty.gov

> Board of Supervisors GLORIA MOLINA First District

MARK RIDLEY-THOMAS Second District

ZEV YAROSLAVSKY Third District

DON KNABE Fourth District

MICHAEL D. ANTONOVICH Fifth District

**September 14, 2011** 

To:

Mayor Michael D. Antonovich

Supervisor Gloria Molina

Supervisor Mark Ridley-Thomas Supervisor Zev Yaroslavsky Supervisor Don Knabe

Ouper visor

From:

William T Fujioka

**Chief Executive Officer** 

REQUEST FOR EXTENSION OF REPORT BACK ON THE DEVELOPMENT OF A FACILITY LOCATION POLICY (SEPTEMBER 7, 2010 AGENDA, ITEM NO. 33-F)

On September 7, 2010, your Board directed this Office to study the Facility Location Policies of the State of California, Federal government, and the City of Los Angeles and, based upon the analyses, develop revisions to the County's Facility Location Policy for consideration by your Board.

We prepared a draft report for review by the Planning Deputies at their monthly meeting on September 8, 2011. During the briefing, the Planning Deputies requested additional time to review the draft and requested we continue the briefing to the next scheduled meeting on October 20, 2011. In addition, we plan to brief the Chief Deputies and Budget Deputies on the recommended change in Policy. Once all concerns and questions have been addressed, we plan to return to your Board with the final Policy recommendations by January 31, 2012.

Should you have any questions in the interim, your staff may contact Jan Takata at (213) 974-1360.

WTF:RLR:os

c: Executive Office, Board of Supervisors County Counsel

U.\CHRONO 2011\CHRONO 2011 [WORD]\Administration (Rita)\Facility Location Policy\_Ext Req 01-31-12\_Ea Supv.docx

"To Enrich Lives Through Effective And Caring Service"

Please Conserve Paper – This Document and Copies are <u>Two-Sided</u> Intra-County Correspondence Sent Electronically Only



Kenneth Hahn Hall of Administration 500 West Temple Street, Room 713, Los Angeles, California 90012 (213) 974-1101 http://ceo.lacounty.gov

> Board of Supervisors GLORIA MOLINA First District

MARK RIDLEY-THOMAS Second District

ZEV YAROSLAVSKY Third District

DON KNABE Fourth District

MICHAEL D. ANTONOVICH Fifth District

February 9, 2012

To:

Supervisor Zev Yaroslavsky, Chairman

Supervisor Gloria Molina

Supervisor Mark Ridley-Thomas

Supervisor Don Knabe

Supervisor Michael D. Antonovich

From:

William T Fujioka

Chief Executive Officer

REQUEST FOR EXTENSION OF FINAL REPORT ON DEVELOPMENT OF A FACILITY LOCATION POLICY (ITEM NO. 33-F, AGENDA OF SEPTEMBER 7, 2010)

On September 7, 2010, your Board directed this office to develop potential revisions to the County's Facility Location Policy based on a review of similar policies that are utilized by the State of California, Federal government, and the City of Los Angeles.

In response to your direction, we have reviewed the aforementioned policies and discussed several approaches with deputies from each of your offices that broaden and refine the criteria that would be considered under a revised County Policy. We are currently incorporating the most recent comments received from your offices and will review a draft of our final report at the monthly Planning Deputies meeting on March 8, 2012. We plan to return to your Board with final Facility Location Policy recommendations by May 29, 2012.

If you have any questions regarding this matter, please contact Jan Takata at (213) 974-1360.

WTF:RLR DJT:mc

c: Executive Office, Board of Supervisors County Counsel

u:\chrono 2012\chrono 2012 [word]\capital projects\facilitylocationpolicyextension.docx



Kenneth Hahn Hall of Administration 500 West Temple Street, Room 713, Los Angeles, California 90012 (213) 974-1101 http://ceo.lacounty.gov

July 3, 2012

Board of Supervisors GLORIA MOLINA First District

MARK RIDLEY-THOMAS Second District

ZEV YAROSLAVSKY Third District

DON KNABE Fourth District

MICHAEL D. ANTONOVICH Fifth District

The Honorable Board of Supervisors County of Los Angeles 383 Kenneth Hahn Hall of Administration 500 West Temple Street Los Angeles, CA 90012

Dear Supervisors:

# FACILITY LOCATION SELECTION APPROVE POLICY REVISION (ALL DISTRICTS) (3 VOTES)

### **SUBJECT**

The recommended actions will revise the County's existing Facility Location Selection Policy to broaden the criteria and analytical process utilized in the development of facility location recommendations to provide the Board with clearer, better balanced, and more consistent facility location recommendations.

#### IT IS RECOMMENDED THAT THE BOARD:

Approve the Revised Facility Location Selection Policy and Process, as described herein, and to be managed by the Chief Executive Office.

#### PURPOSE/JUSTIFICATION OF RECOMMENDED ACTION

The County's current Facility Location Selection Policy (Policy) was adopted by the Board of Supervisors in 1998 and assigns priority to aligning the location of County facilities with programmatic service areas/populations and long-term cost efficiency. On September 7, 2010, the Board directed the Chief Executive Office (CEO) to draft revisions to the current Policy to include consideration of proximity to a central business district, economic development potential, access to public transportation and affordable housing, and existing buildings.

The Honorable Board of Supervisors July 3, 2012 Page 2

In response to the Board's direction, the CEO has reviewed the facility location policies of the Federal and State government, and the City of Los Angeles has prepared revised criteria and process for the preparation and presentation of facility location recommendations for consideration by the Board of Supervisors.

It is intended that the proposed revisions to the Policy will apply to new General Fund leases and new capital construction projects. The Revised Policy will be administered by the CEO.

### **Current Location Selection Policy**

Under the County's current Policy, priority is placed on centralized locations for central service departments, proximity of regional service departments to service areas/populations, and the co-location of departments that serve overlapping service populations. Access to public transportation is an important factor, although it is not explicitly stated in the current Policy. Finally, priority is also placed on one-time acquisition and construction costs, ongoing operational costs, and long-term cost mitigation opportunities.

The primary goals underlying the facility location policies utilized by the Federal and State governments, and the City of Los Angeles vary slightly based upon the nature and breadth of their functional and operational perspectives. The Federal government, for instance, primarily focuses on the development and redevelopment of the nation's cities and assigns priorities to the conservation of resources and improvement of social, economic, environmental, and cultural conditions of urban communities. The Federal policy also stresses conformity with State and local development objectives, as well as a preference for centralized business areas.

The State's facility location policy is designed to support sound growth patterns in the State's local jurisdictions by minimizing the impact of State-owned assets through utilization of existing State-owned assets, improving accessibility, and reducing environmental impacts. The City of Los Angeles has placed a priority on consolidating departments that provide city-wide services in the Civic Center, and those that serve specific regions or communities at its regional and community centers. Such a consolidation is intended to support the conservation of existing urban infrastructure and resources.

All three entities support their primary goals by placing further emphasis on consideration of the potential impact on a region's or community's social, economic, historic, and cultural fabric; the availability of affordable housing for its employees; and accessibility to public transportation.

The current location selection criteria of the Federal, State, and City governments, as well as the County, are summarized in the following table.

Selection Criteria	Federal	California	City of L.A.	County
Central Business Area	*	*	*	
Proximity to Specified Service Area			*	*
Economic Development Potential	*	*	*	
Accessibility to Public Transportation	*	*	*	—
Availability of Affordable Housing for Employees	*	*	*	-
Reuse of Historic Buildings	*	*	*	
Availability of Existing Buildings	*	*	*	
Consistency with Local Land Use Plans	*	*		
Cost		*		*

#### **Revised Selection Criteria and Process**

The Revised Policy redefines the categories of service functions, yet continues to give priority to aligning service functions with client populations. Other factors that contribute to the analysis of potential facility locations, however, would be expanded to include criteria that are also considered by the Federal government, State of California, and City of Los Angeles.

Consideration of these additional factors, or "Location Selection Criteria", is intended to enhance the analysis of potential facility locations and provide the County Board of Supervisors with greater clarity and consistency in its decision-making process. It should also provide a more comprehensive and better balanced perspective of a facility's ability to service a targeted area, its compatibility with local communities, and the fiscal costs. The proposed criteria and analytical process would be applied on a facility-by-facility basis and is outlined below.

# a. Establish service function categories

- <u>Central general government functions</u>: e.g., Executive Officer, Board of Supervisors, CEO, Auditor-Controller, County Counsel, Human Resources, and Chief Information Office.
- <u>Countywide general government service functions</u>: e.g., Assessor, Internal Services, Regional Planning, Registrar-Recorder/County Clerk, and Treasurer and Tax Collector.

The Honorable Board of Supervisors July 3, 2012 Page 4

- Regional and local public service functions: e.g., Agricultural Commissioner/Weights and Measures. Animal Care and Control. Beaches and Harbors, Children and Family Services, Community and Senior Services, Chief Medical Examiner-Coroner, District Attorney, Fire, Health, Mental Health, Military and Veterans Affairs, Museum of Art, Museum of Natural History, **Parks** and Recreation. Probation. Public Defender, Public Health, Public Library, Public Social Services, Public Works, and Sheriff.
- b. Determine service area(s) for each department.
- c. Apply Location Selection Criteria to service area data:
  - Need for proximity to service area and population.
  - Need for proximity to existing County facilities.
  - Need for proximity to Los Angeles Civic Center.
  - Economic development potential.
  - Proximity to public transportation.
  - Availability of affordable housing for County employees.
  - Use of historic buildings.
  - Availability and compatibility of existing buildings.
  - Compatibility with local land use plans.
  - Estimated acquisition/construction and ongoing operational costs.
- d. Analyze results and identify location alternatives.
- e. Determine benefits and drawbacks of each alternative based upon functional needs, service area, cost, and other Location Selection Criteria.
- f. Formulate location recommendations to Board of Supervisors for final location selection decision.

This Revised Policy and Process will be implemented immediately upon approval by the Board.

#### Implementation of Strategic Plan Goals

The recommended actions will support the Board-approved County Strategic Plan Goals of Operational Effectiveness (Goal 1) by maximizing the effectiveness of process, structure, and operations to support timely delivery of customer-oriented and efficient public service.

The Honorable Board of Supervisors July 3, 2012 Page 5

### FISCAL IMPACT/FINANCING

Approval of the Revised Policy and Process is intended to decrease long-term operational costs by enhancing service support and optimizing operational efficiencies. There will be no short-term impact on the General Fund fiscal position.

#### **ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENTATION**

The Revised Policy is not a project under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) because it is an activity that is excluded from the definition of a project by Section 15378(b) of the State CEQA Guidelines. The proposed actions are administrative activities of government that will not result in direct or indirect physical changes to the environment.

# IMPACT ON CURRENT SERVICES OR PROJECTS

The recommended actions will not have an adverse impact on County services or projects.

### **CONCLUSION**

Please return one adopted copy of this Board letter to the Chief Executive Office, Capital Projects Division.

Respectfully submitted,

WILLIAN T FÜJIOKA Chief Executive Officer

WTF:RLR DJT:cvb

c: Executive Office, Board of Supervisors County Counsel